DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 445 JC 870 076

AUTHOR	Tobias, Earole; And Others
TITLE	Faculty Performance Management System: The Faculty Development/Evaluation System at Beaufort Technical College, 1986-1987. Revised.
INSTITUTION	Beaufort Technical Coll., SC. Center for Staff and Curriculum Development.
PUB DATE	Aug 86
NOTE	67p.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Handbooks; Peer Evaluation; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Designed for faculty members at Beaufort Technical College (BTC) in South Carolina, this handbook describes the college's faculty evaluation process and procedures. The first sections of the handbook explain the rationale and method for the faculty evaluation process, state the purposes and objectives of the system, and offer a model which breaks the faculty role into teaching and instruction, student advisement, college service, community service, and professional development. Next, the five-point scale used to rate faculty performance in each area is presented. A calendar of events is followed by an explanation of the weighting system used in the evaluation; a chart displaying the percentages associated with each evaluation area; information on the peer appeals panel; and an explanation of the determination of overall ratings. The bulk of the handbook consists of appendices providing information and sample forms related to the Faculty Performance Management System, student evaluation of faculty, student evaluation of advisors, and the evaluation portfolio's contents. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277445

JC 870 076

FACULTY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

BTC 1986-1987

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Seitz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FPMS:

THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT/EVALUATION SYSTEM

AT BEAUFORT TECHNICAL COLLEGE

revised August 1986

Earole Tobias
Roy Biles
Fred Seitz

Center for Staff and Curriculum Development
Beaufort Technical College
P. O. Box 1288
Beaufort, South Carolina 29901

INDEX

Preface..... i

Introduction..... ii

Purposes and Objectives..... 1

Faculty Role Model..... 2

Ratings and Level Definitions..... 3

Calendar..... 4

Role Parameters..... 6

Weightings/Source..... 7

Peer Appeals Panel..... 8

Determination of Overall Rating..... 9

Appendices..... 10

PREFACE

Faculty members should carefully read the Introduction and procedures for evaluation. The Introduction explains the rationale and method for the evaluation process. The procedures discuss the objectives of faculty evaluation and identify the goals of the comprehensive system. Included is a chart displaying the percentages associated with each evaluation area and a definitive description of the faculty roles in each of the five areas to be evaluated. The rating system is based on a four point scale ranging from "exceeds performance requirements" to "below performance requirements" with specific explanations for the assignment of each rating. Finally, a calendar pinpointing important deadlines for the components of the evaluation process is presented.

The evaluation process and procedures of the college are a part of the Faculty Performance Management System (FPMS) mandated by the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education and provide a systematic implementation and documentation of the requirements of the FPMS.

INTRODUCTION

The faculty evaluation system at Beaufort Technical College was developed through participation with seven other community colleges throughout the United States in a three-year "National Faculty Evaluation Project for Community and Junior Colleges" sponsored by the University of Florida.

The system was designed by a planning team with the assistance of a consultant. As the plan has been developed, each phase has been presented to the Faculty Senate for review and endorsement. The original planning team members were Carole Tobias, Chairman, Roy Giles, Keith Samuels, and Fred Seitz. Consultant for the committee was Dr. Al Smith, Professor of Higher Education and Assistant Director of the Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida.

On an annual, on-going basis, a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate is appointed to monitor the evaluation/develompent process and to provide assistance in refining or revising the system. Membership of this committee consists of one faculty member from each of the instructional divisions and one division dean. Members of this subcommittee for the current year are listed in Appendix 5.

This is a comprehensive, individualized approach to reviewing and evaluating a number of activities associated with the more important roles performed by college faculty members. The process allows faculty members the opportunity to define their own professional images.

While it is not possible or desirable to identify and review all the roles of a faculty member for evaluation purposes, those incorporated within this system include five recognized as being most important, based on the results of a survey of the total faculty. The planning committee was careful to see that only those roles that could be reviewed efficiently and effectively were included in the system.

The system consists of five major faculty roles:

1. Teaching and Instruction
    a. Teaching Performance
    b. Instructional Development
    c. Instructional Management
2. Student Advisement
3. College Service
4. Community Service
5. Professional Development

An institutional minimum and maximum value (weight) for each role relative to the total system has been established. These values reflect the philosophy of the institution as to the importance of each role within the faculty member's total responsibilities.

Data gathered for review and for evaluation are obtained from student surveys and the faculty member's Rating Officer. A value is pre-established by the faculty member and the Rating Officer for the degree of impact that data from each source has on each role.

At the beginning of the rating period, the Rating Officer will review job duties, determine objectives to be accomplished during the rating period, and determine which performance characteristics are most important for the position of the faculty member to be appraised. The Rating Officer will then meet with the Reviewing Officer to discuss both the objectives and the criteria by which the faculty member will be appraised. Once agreement has been reached between the Rating Officer and the Reviewing Officer, the Rating Officer will meet with the faculty member to discuss the objectives and the criteria the faculty member will be evaluated on over the rating period. Should the Rating Officer and faculty member jointly agree to change the objectives or criteria the performance appraisal, they may do so; however, the Rating Officer has the final decision. Should significant changes occur during the rating period, the criteria on the performance appraisal will be modified to incorporate such changes.

Faculty members may contract for an exceeds (E) rating in the areas of Instructional Management, Instructional Development, College Service, Community Service, and/or Professional Development. Any additional objectives or criteria that are incorporated into the agreement as a result of this contract negotiation must be approved by the Reviewing Officer.

Each faculty member will sign his or her performance evaluation document at the bottom of the first page, indicating a review of the criteria by which he or she will be rated. The faculty member will receive a copy for reference during the rating period.

PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF FACULTY EVALUATION

In an effort to promote understanding among the faculty of the relationship among faculty evaluation, faculty growth, and the development of the competency-based educational process at Beaufort Technical College, the following purposes and objectives have been developed.

1. To develop a framework within which the instructional process can be effectively assessed in order to promote student achievement.

2. To establish an evaluation process which assesses the strengths and weaknesses of faculty for the purposes of improving instruction and encouraging professional growth through a meaningful development program.

3. To create a means of assessing performance of faculty for the purpose of distribution of merit pay, if merit pay is available.

FACULTY ROLE MODEL

(Five Areas and Definitions)

1. TEACHING AND INSTRUCTION consists of

   a. Teaching Performance, defined as providing students with course documentation, demonstrating effective interaction skills, relating instruction/materials to course objectives, using practical examples and illustrations;
   b. Instructional Development, defined as course and curriculum design; review and, as needed, design of new programs; updating current courses; preparing syllabi; participating in the development/revision of other instructional materials, such as transparencies and handouts; remaining current in teaching field; and
   c. Instructional Management, defined as classroom management, keeping assigned office hours, and submitting of reports in a timely manner.

2. STUDENT ADVISEMENT is defined as both assisting the student with making sound academic decisions related to course selection, course load, and academic performance and acting in the capacity of liaison for student with faculty and administrators.

3. COLLEGE SERVICE is defined as service rendered by a faculty member in support of his/her instructional area, division, or total college.

4. COMMUNITY SERVICE is defined as the application of a faculty member's recognized area of expertise in the community without pay. department.

5. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT is defined as activities that will develop professional and personal competencies so as to improve the faculty member's knowledge skills and proficiency in his or her present position.

Whenever a faculty member is reassigned from the faculty roles outlined above, his or her evaluation will be adjusted according to both the percentage and the duration of the reassignment. For example, a faculty member may be reassigned one quarter time for one term to develop a certificate program. In another case, a faculty member may be reassigned from teaching one quarter time each quarter in order to handle administrative matters. In each case the percentage of the faculty member's effort spent over the rating period in the five defined faculty roles will be evaluated under the Faculty Development/Evaluation System. The percentage of effort that was reassigned over the rating period will be evaluated by the supervisor/rating officer.

RATINGS AND LEVEL DEFINITIONS

Ratings for each component of the evaluation are based on a four-point scale:

Exceeds Performance Requirements--(4)

Work that is characterized by exemplary accomplishments throughout the rating period; performance that is considerably and consistently above the requirements of the position to which the faculty member is assigned. (E)

Meets Performance Requirements--(3)

Work that meets the expectations and requirements of the assigned position throughout the rating period; performance may fluctuate during the rating period to include exceeding the job requirements in some areas. (M)

Needs Improvement--(2)

Performance that needs improvement is demonstrated by performance levels that are recognized as deficient in one or more criteria, but there is evidence to suggest that satisfactory performance is possible with appropriate professional development and assistance. Achievements are not well documented or always evident.

Below Performance Requirements--(1)

Substandard work performance below the job requirements. (B)

Ratings of Exceeds Performance Requirements (4), Needs Improvement (2), or Below Performance Requirements (1), must be fully justified in writing and/or documented by reference to student evaluation results.

For a Meets Performance Requirements (3), it is highly recommended that a response be written to indicate to what degree the faculty member received this rating. A written response is desirable because occasionally a faculty member may perform above the minimum requirements for a position on a continuous basis throughout the rating period, but not at the Exceeds Performance Requirements level.

FACULTY EVALUATION CALENDAR OF EVENTS

Fall Quarter

August	Orientation and training of new faculty and Rating Officers. Review/training for returning faculty and Rating Officers
September	Rating Officer reviews proposed objectives with Reviewing Officer.
	Faculty member and Rating Officer will complete the planning stage of the Faculty Performance Management System (FPMS). Two copies will be made - one to be given to the Faculty member and one to be kept by the Rating Officer. The original will be submitted to the Reviewing Officer by the end of the fourth week and then forwarded to the Curriculum Development Office.
	Election of Peer Panel by end of month.
October	During fourth week of quarter Faculty members will select student proctors and notify the Curriculum Development Office.
	During the fifth week of quarter student questionnaire will be administered by the Curriculum Development Office.
	Results of the student questionnaire will be returned to the Faculty member and Rating Officer by the end of the sixth week of the quarter.
November	Faculty member will submit to Rating Officer first syllabus by the end of month.
	Advising Evaluation will be conducted during registration for Winter Quarter.
	Faculty member will receive comment sheets from student questionnaire after fall quarter exams.

Winter Quarter

December	Rating Officer will return to Faculty member the rating on the first syllabus before the beginning of Christmas break.
January	Curriculum Development Office will send preliminary rating on Advising Evaluation Questionnaire to Faculty member and Rating Officer by the second week.

January (con't) — Mid-year review of faculty performance will be conducted by Rating Officer with Faculty member. All revisions to Performance Management System planning form will be made on a new document. Two copies will be made - one for Faculty member and one for Rating Officer, each to be attached to copies of original FPMS. The original revised document will be sent to Reviewing Officer by the end of month and forwarded to Curriculum Development Office.

February — During the sixth week of quarter Faculty member will select Student Proctors and notify the Curriculum Development Office.

During the eighth week of quarter the student questionnaire will be administered by the Curriculum Development Office.

Results of the student questionnaire will be returned to the Faculty member and Rating Officer by the end of the tenth week of the quarter.

Faculty member will submit second syllabus to Rating Officer by the end of month.

Advising Evaluation will be conducted during registration for spring quarter.

Spring Quarter

March — Rating Officer will return to Faculty member rating on the second syllabus by the end of the second week.

April — Faculty member will submit portfolios on Instructional Managment, College Service, Community Service, and Professional Development to the Rating Officer by the First of April.

Curriculum Development Office will send cumulative rating on Advising Evaluation Questionnaire to Faculty member and Rating Officer by end of first week.

Rating Officer will review the FPMS results with the Reviewing Officer by mid-April.

May — Rating Officer will review the FPMS results with Faculty member by the first of May.

Rating Officer will send final signed copies to Reviewing Officer by mid-May.

Rating Officer may begin or complete discussions on tenative FPMS goals/objectives for next academic year.

ROLE PARAMETERS

(Relative Importance of Each Role to Institution)

Minimum Weight		Maximum Weight
60%	Teaching and Instruction	80%
5%	*Student Advisement	15%
5%	College Service	20%
0%	Community Serivce	10%
5%	Professional Development	30%

*Faculty members not assigned advising duties will be exempted from advising role.

During the planning conference, the faculty member with his Rating Officer will select the percentage weight to be assigned to each role area and enter each percentage selected in the proper column of BTC form FE. The faculty member will develop at least one objective for Instructional Development, Instructional Management, College Service and/or Community Service. For each objective listed under Professional Development, a Faculty Development Plan will be submitted to the Rating Officer by the faculty member.

The objectives should be entered in either Section I or Section II of the FPMS as appropriate.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT/EVALUATION

WEIGHTINGS/SOURCE SUMMARY

FACULTY ROLE	STUDENT	SUPERVISOR
1. Teaching/Instruction 60 - 80%		
A. Teaching Performance	60% Questionnaire (See Appendix 2)	---
B. Instructional Development	---	35% Portfolio
C. Instructional Management	---	5% Portfolio
2. Student Advisement 5 - 15%	100% Questionnaire (See Appendix 3)	---
3. College Service 5 - 20%	---	100% Portfolio
4. Community Service 0 - 10%	---	100% Portfolio
5. Professional Development 5 - 30%	---	100% Portfolio

PEER APPEALS PANEL

Any faculty member may appeal any rating given by his or her Rating Officer. Appeals must be submitted in writing within five working days from receipt of rating. The appeal will be routed to the Reviewing Officer who will notify the chairperson of the Peer Appeals Panel within two working days.

Within five working days of receipt of notifcation from the Reviewing Officer, the chairperson will convene the panel to review evaluation materials of the faculty member's FPMS. Prior ratings will not be known by the panel. If a representative from the Faculty member's area is not on the panel, a representative may be used by the panel. The representative will act as a consultant; he/she will not have a vote and will not be present during voting.

Each member of the panel will independently determine a rating. The chairman will tabulate the individual panel member's ratings and calculate an average rating. The average rating will be sent to the Reviewing Officer as a recommendation within seven working days from initial notification. The Reviewing Officer will meet with Rating Officer to discuss the recommendation of peer panel. Final disposition of the appeal will be given to faculty member by Rating Officer within five working days of receipt of the peer panel's recommendation.

The Peer Appeals Panel will consist of a representative from each instructional division. The representative will be elected by the full-time faculty of the division. Rating Officers are not eligible to serve on the panel. Representatives will serve a staggered two-year term. The Chairman of the panel will be elected by members of the panel. The Chairman must be a second-year member.

DETERMINATION OF OVERALL RATING

The determination of an overall rating for each faculty member is calculated using the selected percentages for each component, the results of student evaluation of instruction and advising, and the Rating Officer evaluations of portfolio contents.

Each individual result and the overall total are then converted from the institutional index scale (1-4) to the FPMS scale (1-3) using the following table:

Institutional Index		FPMS Rating
0 - 2.49	=	B (Below)
2.5 - 3.5	=	M (Meets)
3.51 - 4	=	E (Exceeds)

Regardless of the overall total rating, no faculty member may receive an overall E (Exceeds) rating unless (1) all components of the system on which the faculty member is evaluated receive at least a rating of M (Meets) and (2) the student evaluation of teaching average score is at least 3.30 for the two quarters evaluated.

APPENDICES

1. FPMS

    1-A Procedure
    1-B Form
    1-C Rating Officer Summary Sheet/Conversion Table

2. Student Evaluation of Faculty

    2-A Questionnaire
    2-B Administration Procedure
    2-C Interpretation of Data

3. Student Evaluation of Advisor

    3-A Questionnaire
    3-B Administration Procedure
    3-C Interpretation of Data

4. Portfolio Contents

    4-A Syllabus: Definition and Concept
    Rating Officer Check Sheet
    4-B College Service
    4-C Community Service
    4-D Professional Development/Plan

5. Faculty Senate Subcommittee on Faculty Evaluation membership.

Appendix 1

FPMS

STATE BOARD FOR TECHNICAL AND COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION

PROCEDURE

Title	Number	Page
FACULTY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (FPMS)	8-4-101.1	1 of 8
Based on Policy Number: 8-4-101 — Title: FACULTY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	Date: 4/24/85	
Office of Responsibility: Personnel	Revision:	

Wynona D. Sheely 4/24/85
Division Director — Date

William Dudley 4/24/85
Executive Director — Date

These procedures are in accordance with the policies and procedures of the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education for establishment and administration of the Teaching Faculty Performance Management System.

I. Purpose:

The primary purpose of the FPMS is to increase the overall efficiency of the agency by helping each teaching faculty member to improve performance. Other important purposes include:

A. To encourage continued growth and development of all faculty members;

B. To identify faculty members who have potential for promotion;

C. To provide information to the faculty members, supervisors and managers to use in making work-related decisions;

D. To help faculty members use their full potential in carrying out their job responsibilities;

E. To identify training needs;

F. To maintain a documented history of the faculty member's performance;

G. To provide documentation to support recommendations for salary increases, promotions, transfers, demotions or dismissals;

H. To assist management in assigning work and delegating responsibility based on a mutual understanding of the faculty member's skills and abilities;

I. To enhance other personnel administration components such as selection and placement.

II. Training:

Training shall be mandatory on the Faculty Performance Appraisal System for all faculty members. New faculty members shall be briefed on the performance appraisal system during their orientation session.

Supervisory employees shall receive a detailed training session that will concentrate on the criteria for evaluating their individual faculty members. It will be mandatory for all faculty members who are promoted into a supervisory position to receive the supervisory training session.

III. Levels of Performance:

A. The FPMS will consist of three (3) levels of performance which are defined as follows:

BELOW PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS - Substandard work performance below the job requirements. (B)

MEETS PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS - Work that meets the expectations and requirements of the assigned position throughout the rating period; performance may fluctuate during the rating period to include exceeding the job requirements in some areas. (M)

EXCEEDS PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS - Work that is characterized by exemplary accomplishments throughout the rating period; performance that is considerably and consistently above the requirements of the position to which the faculty member is assigned. (E)

For each individual item in Sections I, II, III, IV and the overall evaluation in Section V of the appraisal form, a detailed explanation is required to support a rating of Below or Exceeds Performance Requirements.

For a Meets Performance Requirements, it is highly recommended that a response be written to indicate to what degree the faculty member received this rating. A written response is desired because one may not only have a faculty member who occasionally performs above the minimum requirements for a position but may do so on a continuous basis throughout the rating period but not at the Exceeds Performance Requirement level.

Any faculty member who received an overall formal rating of Below Performance Requirements must be terminated from the position for which they receive this rating.

B. Substandard Performance

Substandard performance is defined as performance that is less than the minimum

STATE BOARD FOR TECHNICAL AND COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION

PROCEDURE

Title	Number	Page
FACULTY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (FPMS)	8-4-101.1	3 of 8
Based on Policy Number / **Title**		**Date**
8-4-101 / FACULTY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM		4/24/85
Office of Responsibility / Personnel		**Revision**

performance requirements and will result in a faculty member receiving a formal rating of Below Performance Requirements unless improvement is shown.

In order to ensure that faculty members are given adequate notice of their substandard performance, along with the opportunity to improve such performance prior to the formal evaluation, the following procedures shall be followed regarding substandard performance:

1. At least 30 days and no more than 120 days prior to a faculty member receiving a Below Performance Requirements rating, the supervisor shall provide the faculty member with a written warning notice of substandard performance.

2. The following will be required in issuing an Official Warning Notice:

   a. All warning notices must be in writing and labeled as a warning of substandard performance.

   b. Warning notices shall be addressed to the faculty member whose performance is in question.

   c. Written warning notices shall list areas where performance is deficient and ways to improve such deficiencies.

   d. Specific time periods for improvement and possible consequences shall be included in a written warning notice.

   e. The faculty member shall sign the warning notice and be provided with a copy. A copy of the warning notice will also be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

   f. Warning notices shall include the proviso that a rating of Below Performance Requirements shall result if performance is not brought up to standards in the time period specified.

3. During the warning period, the faculty member and the supervisor shall have regularly scheduled meetings during which they shall discuss the faculty member's progress. These meetings shall be documented and included in the faculty member's official personnel file.

4. If the faculty member's performance is rated "Meets Performance Requirements" or above at the end of the warning period, employment shall continue. If rated "Below Performance Requirements", the faculty member shall be removed from the position immediately.

5. An official warning notice may be initiated any time the supervisor believes that the faculty member's performance is below standard.

6. Any faculty member whose performance requires more than two substandard warning processes within 365 days shall be terminated upon receipt of the third warning notice of substandard performance.

IV. Types of Performance Appraisals

A. Probational Performance Appraisal

The performance of each teaching faculty employee who has been given an original, reinstatement, or reassignment appointment shall be appraised prior to the completion of their initial nine (9) months probationary period of service in the position. The probationary period may be extended for a maximum of three (3) months based on a written warning notice prior to the end of the nine months probationary period. At the end of the three months extension, a performance appraisal must be completed. Failure to complete a performance appraisal or warning notice at the end of the nine months probationary period will automatically categorize the faculty member as "Meets Performance Requirements" with all rights and privileges of a permanent faculty member.

B. Regular Performance Appraisal

All permanent faculty members shall have a regular performance appraisal prior to the end of the employment agreement. The appraisal must be reviewed and discussed with the Reviewing Officer then discussed with the faculty member. The completed form must be sent to the Personnel Office at least twenty (20) calendar days before the end of the rating period.

C. Special Performance Appraisals

A special performance appraisal is one conducted during the rating period other than a probational or permanent appraisal. Special appraisals shall be used to identify serious mistakes or problem areas in the faculty member's overall performance. The criteria for a special appraisal shall be those agreed upon at the beginning of the rating period. The special appraisal will support an official warning notice of substandard performance (Section III, B).

STATE BOARD FOR TECHNICAL AND COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION

PROCEDURE

Title	Number	Page
FACULTY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (FPMS)	8-4-101.1	5 of 8
Based on Policy Number / Title	Date	
8-4-101 FACULTY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	4/24/85	
Office of Responsibility: Personnel	Revision	

V. Faculty Member to be Appraised

All faculty members who occupy a permanent position shall have their performance evaluated in accordance with the FPMS program. Performance appraisals shall become a permanent part of the employee's official personnel file and upon request the employee will be provided a copy.

VI. Rating Officer

The Rating Officer is the faculty member's immediate supervisor. All performance appraisals shall be made by the faculty member's supervisor who has first-hand experience or knowledge of the work being performed. The supervisor is not only responsible for the overall performance evaluation, he/she is responsible for providing the faculty member with day-to-day feedback on how he/she is performing his/her duties and responsibilities.

Before the Rating Officer reviews the performance appraisal form with the faculty member either at the planning stage or final appraisal, he/she must review the form with the Reviewing Officer.

VII. Reviewing Officer

The Reviewing Officer shall be the appropriate Division Chairman/Dean and/or VP for Academic Affairs/Dean of Instruction. The Reviewing Officer is responsible for reviewing the performance appraisal developed by the Rating Officer. The Reviewing Officer will provide comment on the criteria selected for an individual appraisal and the overall rating. When there is disagreement between the Rating Officer and the Reviewing Officer, every effort should be made to find agreement before the faculty member reviews the performance appraisal. The Reviewing Officer may not change the overall appraisal by the Rating Officer without concurrence.

In reviewing performance appraisals, the Reviewing Officer shall ensure that common criteria exists for like positions. This will ensure that positions with the same or like duties and responsibilities have similar criteria for evaluation.

VIII. Performance Appraisal Instrument

A. Planning Stage

Prior to the beginning of the rating period the Rating Officer will develop job

duties, determine objectives to be accomplished during the rating period, and determine what performance characteristics are most important for the position of the faculty member to be appraised. The Rating Officer will then meet with the Reviewing Officer to discuss the criteria by which the faculty member will be appraised. Once agreement has been reached by the Rating Officer and Reviewing Officer, the Rating Officer will meet with the faculty member to discuss the criteria the faculty member will be evaluated on over the rating period. Should the Rating Officer and faculty member jointly agree to change the criteria on the performance appraisal, they may do so; however, the supervisor has the final decision. Should significant changes occur during the rating period, the criteria on the performance appraisal should be modified to incorporate such changes.

All employees will sign their performance evaluation documents at the bottom of the first page indicating that they have reviewed the criteria by which they will be rated. It is recommended that the faculty member receive a copy so that they can reference the criteria during their rating period.

B. Job Duties

Job duties are defined as those overall job responsibilities that are unique to teaching faculty. All teaching faculty within the South Carolina Technical Education System will be rated on six (6) specific job duties as follows:

1. Instructional Development - course and curriculum design; review and, as needed, design new programs; update current courses; prepare syllabuses; participate in the development/revision of other instructional materials, such as transparencies and handouts; remain current in teaching field.

2. Teaching Performance - providing students with course documentation, demonstrating effective interaction skills, relating instruction/materials to course objectives, using practical examples and illustrations.

3. Student Advisement - student development, academic advising, recruitment placement.

4. College and/or Community Service - support and contributions to the college by working on committees and/or performing public service for the college.

STATE BOARD FOR TECHNICAL AND COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION

PROCEDURE

Title	Number	Page
FACULTY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (FPMS)	8-4-101.1	7 of 8
Based on Policy Number 8-4-101 Title FACULTY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	Date 4/24/85	
Office of Responsibility Personnel	Revision	

5. Professional Development - Activities that will develop professional and personal competencies so as to improve the faculty member's knowledge skills and proficiency in their present position - this item will tie in with the compensation plan when faculty members begin to make plans for advancement in the plan.

6. Instructional Management - classroom management, control, office hours, submission of reports in a timely manner.

The above job duties are not intended to be exclusive, expanded or additional duties may be includ d. The maximum number of job duties for faculty members may not exceed ten 0).

During the planning ge, the Rating Officer and faculty member will have the opportunity to discus he accuracy of the job duties as they relate to the work performed by the fac y member.

The Rating Officer mu t provide separate comments on each job duty for which the faculty member rec ived an Exceeds or Below Performance Requirements rating.

C. Objectives

Objectives are defined as those projects, programs or other issues that should be focused upon by the faculty member during the rating period. These projects/programs may be at the direction of the supervisor or jointly initiated by the faculty member and supervisor. Objectives may be added or deleted during the rating period. Objectives may only be deleted if the objective is replaced by another objective or if the objective is no longer important to the department. Objectives may be added if their completion date is within the rating period. Faculty will have at least one objective to complete during the evaluation period.

The Rating Officer must provide separate comments on each objective for which the employee receives an Exceeds or Below Performance Requirements.

D. Performance Characteristics

Section III consists of performance characteristics on which all faculty members must be rated. The performance characteristics to be selected are those that are essential to the successful performance of the position to be rated. When determining what characteristics will be selected, it is essential that they are job related. Performance characteristics should help support previous rating for job duties and objectives

The Rating Officer must provide comments for ratings of Exceeds or Below Performance Requirements.

E. Additional Characteristics for Appraisals of Supervisors Only

Selected management characteristics are designed to evaluate supervisors on their abilities to plan, organize, control, motivate, develop, and promote equal opportunity for their immediate staff. All supervisors will be rated on each management characteristic during their performance appraisal. Additional management characteristics may be added if they relate specifically to the job.

Comments are required for ratings of Exceeds or Below Performance Requirements.

F. Overall Summary

Section V of the performance appraisal instrument summarizes the overall rating and provides space for supervisory and employee comments.

Part 1 is a narrative comment by the supervisor on the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses as it relates to the faculty member's performance over the rating period.

Part 2 is a narrative recommendation by the supervisor on what action the faculty member or agency should undertake to improve or maintain the faculty member's performance or potential.

Part 3 is the supervisor's overall performance appraisal for the faculty member being rated.

Part 4 is a written justification for a faculty member's overall rating of Exceeds or Below Performance Requirements. While a justification is not required for a Meets Performance Requirements, it is strongly recommended that an explanation be written.

Part 5 is an optional narrative response for the faculty member to complete if he/she wishes to express his/her opinion (agreements and disagreements) on his/her performance rating.

STATE BOARD FOR TECHNICAL & COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION

FACULTY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Name _____ Social Security No. _____

Job Title _____ Division _____

State Employment Date _____ Job Date _____

Performance Period: From _____ To _____

INDIVIDUAL AND OVERALL PERFORMANCE LEVELS

***BELOW PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS** - Substandard work performance below the job requirements. (B)

MEETS PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS - Work that meets the expectations and requirements of the assigned position throughout the rating period; performance may fluctuate during the rating period to include exceeding the job requirements in some areas. (M)

***EXCEEDS PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS** - Work that is characterized by exemplary accomplishments throughout the rating period; performance that is considerably above the requirements of the position to which the faculty member is assigned. (E)

**Detailed explanation required to support this rating for individual items and overall rating.*

PLANNING STAGE

I have reviewed the job duties, objectives, and performance characteristics with my supervisor. I understand that these criteria will be used for my performance appraisal.

Employee's Signature _____ Date _____

Rater's Signature _____ Date _____

Reviewer's Signature _____ Date _____

SIGNATURE AFTER PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Employee's Signature _____ Date _____

Rater's Signature _____ Date _____

Reviewer's Signature _____ Date _____

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

SECTION I will contain job duties that describe the tasks that are required of each faculty member to successfully meet the requirements of their position. Six (6) job duties are predetermined and apply to all teaching faculty. Up to four (4) optional job duties may be assigned to each individual faculty member.

SECTION II allows the identification of objectives for the review period and allows for documenting projects/programs initiated by the faculty member during the rating period. The supervisor and faculty member may jointly add or delete during the rating period. Objectives may only be added if their completion date is within the rating period. At least one objective will be required each rating period.

SECTION III will contain performance characteristics to be identified by the supervisor and faculty member as those characteristics essential to successful performance on the job. The faculty member will be rated on at least six (6) performance characteristics listed in Section III. Additional performance characteristics not already listed may be added as long as six listed performance characteristics have been selected. (See Attachment 1 for definitions of performance characteristics.)

SECTION IV will contain performance characteristics for supervisors only. All performance characteristics in this section must be completed. (See Attachment 2 for definitions of performance characteristics for supervisors.)

SECTION V allows the rater to identify the faculty member's major strengths and weaknesses and to recommend appropriate action for the faculty member or college to improve his/her performance or potential. Section V also includes the overall appraisal rating and required justification for an Exceeds or Below Performance Requirement rating. The final part of Section V is an optional section for the faculty member to provide written comments as to whether they agree or disagree with the performance appraisal relating to accuracy, comprehensiveness, and helpfulness.

NOTE: For all Sections an explanation for a rating of Exceeds or Below Performance is required for each item. While a written justification is not required for a Meets Performance Requirements, it is highly recommended that an explanation be written to indicate to what degree the faculty member received this rating.

Performance levels for Sections I, II, III, and IV will be represented by alphabetic characters for each level of performance as follows: (B) Below; (M) Meets; and (E) Exceeds Performance Requirements.

SECTION I

JOB DUTIES

1. Job Duty: Instructional Development _____

Actual Performance _____

Recommended Improvement/Comments _____

Performance Level ☐

2. Job Duty: Teaching Performance _____

Actual Performance _____

Recommended Improvement/Comments _____

Performance Level ☐

3. Job Duty: Student Advisement _____

Actual Performance _____

Recommended Improvement/Comments _____

Performance Level ☐

4. Job Duty: College and/or Community Service _____

Actual Performance _____

Recommended Improvement/Comments _____

Performance Level ☐

5. Job Duty: Professional Development _____

Actual Performance _____

Recommended Improvement/Comments _____

Performance Level ☐

Section I - Continued

6. Job Duty: Instructional Management _____

Performance Level ☐

Actual Performance _____

Recommended Improvement/Comments _____

7. Job Duty: _____

Performance Level ☐

Actual Performance _____

Recommended Improvement/Comments _____

8. Job Duty: _____

Performance Level ☐

Actual Performance _____

Recommended Improvement/Comments _____

9. Job Duty: _____

Performance Level ☐

Actual Performance _____

Recommended Improvement/Comments _____

10. Job Duty: _____

Performance Level ☐

Actual Performance _____

Recommended Improvement/Comments _____

SECTION II

OBJECTIVES

1. Objective: _____

Actual Performance _____

Recommended Improvement/Comments _____

Performance Level ☐

2. Objective: _____

Actual Performance _____

Recommended Improvement/Comments _____

Performance Level ☐

3. Objective: _____

Actual Performance _____

Recommended Improvement/Comments _____

Performance Level ☐

4. Objective: _____

Actual Performance _____

Recommended Improvement/Comments _____

Performance Level ☐

5. Objective: _____

Actual Performance _____

Recommended Improvement/Comments _____

Performance Level ☐

SECTION III
PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS
(See Attachment No. 1 for Definition)

	Rating		Rating
Communication Skill	( )	Initiative	( )
Relationships with Others	( )	Adaptability	( )
Ability to Work Without Supervision	( )	Willingness to Learn	( )
Accuracy of Work	( )	Safety	( )
Cooperation	( )	Enthusiasm	( )
Dependability	( )	Job Knowledge	( )
Use of Work Time	( )	Quality of Work	( )
Meeting Schedules	( )	Relationship with Public	( )
Punctuality	( )	Judgment	( )
_____	( )	_____	( )
_____	( )	_____	( )

Actual Performance _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

SECTION IV
ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS FOR APPRAISAL OF SUPERVISORS
(See Attachment No. 2 for Definitions)

	Rating		Rating
Planning	( )	Controlling	( )
Developing	( )	_____	( )
Organizing	( )	_____	( )
Motivating	( )	_____	( )
Promoting Equal Opportunity	( )	_____	( )

Actual Performance/Recommendation _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

SECTION V

OVERALL SUMMARY

1. Identify the faculty member's performance strengths and weaknesses.

2. Identify what actions are recommended for the faculty member and/or the agency to undertake in order that the faculty member may improve his/her performance and/or potential.

3. OVERALL PERFORMANCE RATING

_____ Below Performance Requirements - Substandard work performance below the job requirements. (B)*

_____ Meets Performance Requirements - Work that meets the expectations and requirements of the assigned position throughout the rating period; performance may fluctuate during the rating period to include exceeding the job requirements in some areas. (M)

_____ Exceeds Performance Requirements - Work that is characterized by exemplary accomplishments throughout the rating period; performance that is considerably above the requirements of the position to which the faculty member is assigned. (E)*

*Detailed explanation required to support this rating.

4. Rater Comments - This space is for justification of an Exceeds or Below Performance Requirements, or for an explanation of Meets Performance Requirements.

5. Faculty Member's Comments (Optional) - What are your opinions (agreements and disagreements) of this performance review relative to accuracy, comprehensiveness and helpfulness?

FACULTY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

FACULTY NAME: _____

Performance Planning and Evaluation

I. **PLANNING:** Selection of Roles and Role Weighting

ROLE	RANGE	SELECTED WEIGHTING
Teaching & Instruction	60 - 80 %	
Student Advisement (*)	5 - 15 %	
College Service	5 - 20 %	
Community Service	0 - 10 %	
Professional Development	5 - 30 %	
		100%

(* Enter 0 for weighting if faculty member has no advising responsibilities

II. EVALUATION RESULTS

JOB DUTY	EVALUATION SOURCE	INST. INDEX	FPMS RATING
1. Instructional Development	Syllabus 1: _____ Syllabus 2: _____		
2. Teaching Performance	Fall Rating: _____ Winter Rating: _____		
3. Student Advising	Overall Rating: _____		
4. College Service	Portfolio Rating: _____		
5. Community Service	Portfolio Rating _____		
6. Professional Development	Portfolio Rating: _____		
7. Instructional Management	Portfolio Rating: _____		
OVERALL EVALUATION			

Appendix 2

Student Evaluation of Faculty

■	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	

Beaufort Technical College

Faculty Evaluation

Student Questionnaire

FEED THIS DIRECTION

SAMPLE

Instructor's Name

Quarter: ___ Summer ___ Fall ___ Winter ___ Spring

Date: ___ Month / ___ Day / ___ Year

SCAN-TRON ® FORM NO. 3415-BTC 840730-791

This questionnaire gives you a chance to express your views of this course. At the same time, it gives you an opportunity to help your instructor improve the instructional process. When you have completed the form, return it to the student representative administering the survey. This representative will return it to the designated area. Neither that office nor your instructor will have any way of knowing how you personally answered these questions.

Please read each statement carefully and select the response which in your judgment best describes the instructor and/or class. Mark only one response for each statement. You must use a number 2 pencil.

STRONGLY AGREE WITH STATEMENT	AGREE WITH STATEMENT	SOMEWHAT AGREE BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	DISAGREE AND NEEDS IMMEDIATE ATTENTION	NOT APPLICABLE OR DON'T KNOW		
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	1. The speed at which the instructor is covering the course material is about right.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	2. The course objectives were distributed and explained at the beginning of the course.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	3. Attendance policies were clearly explained at the beginning of the course.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	4. Course assignments, procedures, expectations, and requirements are clearly explained.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	5. I feel free to ask questions in class.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	6. My instructor speaks audibly and clearly.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	7. My instructor is well-prepared for class.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	8. My instructor deals fairly and impartially with me.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	9. My instructor makes the subject interesting.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	10. My instructor encourages different viewpoints.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	11. My instructor demonstrates knowledge of the subject matter.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	12. A sufficient number of tests and graded assignments are given.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	13. Graded tests and papers are returned in a reasonable amount of time.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	14. Examinations reflect the important aspects of the course and are consistent with class presentations and assignments.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	15. The instructor is available and willing to provide assistance to students outside of class.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	16. The instructor utilizes the total scheduled class time in an effective manner.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	17. For my preparation and ability, the level of difficulty of this course is about right.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	18. I am pleased with the text(s) required for this course.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	19. Library resources to support this course are adequate.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	20. The practical application of this course is apparent.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	21. This course contributes significantly to my career goals and professional development.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	22. I would highly recommend this course to my friends.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	23. The classroom is neat and clean.
						ANSWER QUESTIONS 24-33 ONLY FOR THOSE COURSES WITH A LAB, SHOP, OR CLINIC.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	24. My instructor clearly shows how to use the equipment.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	25. Enough time is allowed for each project.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	26. The lab is a useful part of this course.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	27. The lab helps me better understand and apply the theory and concepts taught in class.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	28. The facilities are usually ready for my class.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	29. I find the lab a good place to work and study.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	30. There is an adequate amount of equipment.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	31. The equipment is up-to-date and in good condition.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	32. The lab facility is well-organized.
—	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	33. The lab facility is neat and clean.

36

The college and faculty appreciate your assistance in improving instruction and your cooperation in completing this evaluation form.

If you have additional comments or suggestions, please use the comment sheet provided.

INSTRUCTOR:_____
COURSE:_____

BEAUFORT TECHNICAL COLLEGE

FACULTY EVALUATION STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Please respond to these additional questions:

___ 1. The speed at which the instructor is covering the course materials is:

a. about right b. too fast c. too slow d. don't know

___ 2. The number of tests and graded assignments is:

a. about right b. too many c. too few d. don't know

___ 3. For my ability, this course is:

a. about right b. too easy c. too difficult d. don't know

II. Student comments

Please use this section for any additional comments you may care to make on the instructor, this course, or any other instructional matters that may concern you. We need your input to assure that the College provides quality education and meets the needs of all its students. Thank you for your assistance.

STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

Administration Procedure

1. Evaluation will be conducted during the fifth week of the Fall quarter and during eighth week of Winter quarter. New faculty who are evaluated during Fall Quarter may be evaluated during Spring Quarter. Faculty may request evaluation at any other time on a confidential basis. (Temporary faculty will be evaluated every quarter.)

2. With computerized scoring, results will be returned to the faculty member and Rating Officer within one week of administration.

3. The questionnaire will be student administered. The classroom instructor will leave the room during administration. The student classroom representative will pick up the packets and return them to the designated area.

4. The questionnaire has been divided into three areas: (A) instructor evaluation, (B) course evaluation, and (C) facility evaluation.

   A. Instructor evaluations
      questions 1-16, 24

   B. Course evaluation
      questions 17-22, 25-27

   C. Facility evaluation
      questions 23, 28-33

   Data will be broken out separately for each area. Only instructor evaluation data (A) will be used to calculate the applied score for teaching and instruction evaluation.

5. The comments portion of the evaluation questionnaire will be returned to the instructor for his/her information. It will not be part of the data computation or summary report.

   The instructor may, as he/she chooses, share these comment sheets with his/her Rating Officer or other person.

6. Separate reports will be broken out for (A) instructor evaluation, (B) course evaluation, and (C) facility evaluation. Individual instructor evaluation reports (A) will be available only to the individual faculty member and his/her Rating Officer. Summary data on instructor evaluation by division will be supplied to the College Dean of Instruction and President. B and C reports will be available as requested throughout the College.

7. All evaluation activity will be coordinated by the Director of Staff and Curriculum Development. Complete confidentiality of the process will be the responsibility of that individual.

PROCEDURE FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME FACULTY

1. Student evaluation of faculty will take place in the fifth week of the fall quarter and the eighth week of other quarters.

2. On or before the third week of the fall quarter, or the sixth week of other quarters, the Curriculum Development Office will provide each instructor with instructions for selecting from each of their courses a student who will be responsible for administering student evaluation of faculty. The instructor will also be provided with an instruction packet to be given to the student.

3. The instructor will select from each class a student who will administer the student evaluation. The instructor will provide an instruction packet to the student which will contain the instructions to be read by the student to the class at the time of the evaluation, a sample evaluation form, and procedure to be used in administering the evaluation. The instructor will inform the student that he/she may contact the Curriculum Development Office for explanation of the procedures. Once the selection is made, the instructor will send to the Curriculum Development Office, the Student Evaluation Cover Sheet (BTC form - FE3) which will incude the following information: course title, official class enrollment, and name of student selected.

4. The Curriculum Development Office is responsible for the packaging of the student evaluations. The Student Evaluation Cover Sheet will be used as a guideline in preparing the packages and will be attached to the front of each package.

5. Before the week of evaluation the Curriculum Development Office will send the student evaluation packages to the appropriate division dean/center coordinators. (Evaluation may occur later depending on quarter calender.)

6. The division deans/center coordinators will distribute the packets to the appropriate instructors within 24 hours of the student evaluation or at the time of student evaluation.

7. At the time of the evaluation, the instructor will complete the cover form attached to the front of the evaluation package. This process will include the noting of actual number of students in attendance, and the signatures of both the instructor and the student proctor and the date of evaluation. When the form has been completed, the instructor will hand the evaluation materials to the student proctor and then leave the classroom.

8. The student proctor will read the Instruction Sheet which will explain the purpose of the evaluation and then hand out the evaluation forms. All leftover forms will be placed in the packet by the student proctor.

9. When students have completed evaluation forms, they will return them to the student proctor. The student proctor will seal packet once all forms are complete.

10. The student proctor will return packet to a predetermined central location (given in instructions) and inform the instructor of the completion of evaluation.

11. The predetermined central location will maintain a log. As each student proctor returns their class evaluations, he/she will be required to log the time, date and sign the log.

12. The predetermined central location will return all completed forms to the Curriculum Development Office.

13. The Curriculum Development Office has the responsibility of processing the completed evaluation forms. This will include scoring and the distribution of processed forms.

INSTRUCTIONS TO INSTRUCTOR

FOR STUDENT EVALUATION

1. During the third week of fall quarter classes, (or the sixth week of other quarters), you will receive a student evaluation cover sheet for each of your classes. All the information required except for name of student proctor and official enrollment will be filled in.

2. Correct any information on the form that is in error. If class has been cancelled, please return to the Curriculum Development Office with that notation.

3. a. Select a student proctor for each course.
   b. Print that person's name in the blank provided on the cover sheet.
   c. Give that person the information packet that came with the cover sheet.

4. Enter the current official course enrollment on the form. This tells us how many evaluation forms to send you.

5. Do not write below the line. This will be completed at the time of evaluation.

6. Return the cover sheets to the Curriculum Development Office (or to your division secretary or center director).

7. On the Friday before the evaluation week the division secetary or center director will receive the evaluation packets.

   (If you have not returned the cover sheet, you will not receive a packet.)

   It is your responsibility to pick up the packets for your classes.

8. On the selected evaluation day for each class during the evaluation week (your choice), give the evaluation packet to the student proctor. You should leave the room while the evaluation is being conducted. The process takes about twenty minutes.

9. Please see that the student proctor has returned the packet as indicated and returned pencils.

10. If you have any questions or problems, please see your Dean or call the Curriculum Development Office.

D-F/38-3 FE 2

APPENDIX 2-B

STUDENT EVALUATION COVER SHEET

Please provide this information so your course evaluation packet can be prepared:

COURSE _____ _____ _____
(prefix) (number) (section)

CAMPUS _____ QUARTER _____ YEAR _____

INSTRUCTOR _____ STUDENT PROCTOR _____

OFFICIAL ENROLLMENT _____

****

The following is to be completed at time of evaluation:

Attendance (actual number of students at time of evaluation) _____

_____ _____
(Instructor's signature) (date)

_____ _____
(Student Proctor's signature) (date)

Please return this packet to the location indicated with your instructions or to the Curriculum Development Office.

D-F/38-4 BTC form FE3

INSTRUCTIONS FOR

_____

STUDENT PROCTOR

_____

(To be given at time of selection)

Your responsibilities as student proctor will be to administer student evaluation of instructor. This evaluation takes place in the fifth week of the fall quarter and the eighth week of other quarters. The actual evaluation materials will be given to you by the instructor during class on the day of the evaluation.

After your selection, you will be given by the instructor a packet containing the following materials:

1. Instruction sheet to be read to class at time of student evaluation
2. A sample student evaluation form
3. Overall procedures for administering the student evaluation

You should read carefully each of the items included in the packet. If you have any questions, you should contact the Curriculum Development Office or your instructor.

Your selection as a student proctor serves as recognition of your responsible attitude. Your assistance in this project is greatly appreciated.

Please call me if you have any questions.

_____

Fred Seitz, Director
Curriculum Development

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING

THE STUDENT EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. In the packet given to you by your instructor are copies of the student evaluation questionnaire to be completed by the students in the class.

2. The specific directions to be read aloud are in quotes. Pause to allow the students appropriate time to carry out the instructions.

READ ALOUD

3. "Even though many of you may recently have filled out evaluation questionnaires in other classes, I would like for you to give careful attention to this questionnaire for this course. Your evaluation will be used by the College to assess the strengths and weaknesses of instructors for the purposes of improving instruction and encouraging professional growth through a meaningful development program. Your evaluation will also be used to create a means of assessing performance of instructors for purposes of distribution of merit pay, should merit pay be available. You need not sign your name to the questionnaire. The original student evaluation questionnaires and comment sheets will not be given to the instructor until final grades have been reported. An average rating will be given to the instructor in the sixth week of the quarter to allow the instructor to improve on weaknesses and emphasize strengths."

READ ALOUD

4. "Do not begin the questionnaire--wait for my directions."

5. Pass out a questionnaire and a comment sheet to each student, and a number 2 pencil to each student who does not have one.

READ ALOUD

6. "Look at the questions on the evaluation form. Use only a number 2 pencil in marking the forms. Do not use X's, check marks, or any marks other than a horizontal mark between the brackets for each answer. If you must erase, do so completely as an incomplete erasure may be scored as an intended answer."

READ ALOUD

7. "Complete the information at the top right-hand corner as I have written it on the chalkboard." (Last name of instructor is adequate; use the current quarter and current month, day, and year.)

READ ALOUD

8. "Do not fill out the top left-hand corner of the form as that will be done through a master sheet."

READ ALOUD

9. "Next complete all items on the questionnaire. For each item, you must mark the one response that is the most appropriate of the five responses available. You must select either 'strongly agree with statement,' 'agree with statement,' 'somewhat agree but needs improvement,' 'disagree and needs immediate attention,' and 'not applicable or don't know.' Again, please only make one mark per question and carefully erase."

READ ALOUD

10. " After you have completed the 33 items on the questionnaire, you are to use the separate supplied sheet to answer a few additional questions and to provide any appropriate comments."

READ ALOUD

11. "When you have finished your questionnaire, please place the completed questionnaire, comments sheets and the pencil furnished you on the instructor's desk. All completed questionnaires and uncompleted questionnaires will be placed in the packet provided and returned to the Curriculum Design Office."

12. Once all questionnaires have been completed, collect the questionnaires, comments sheets, and pencils. Place them in the packet and return as indicated below.

    Day classes, Beaufort campus: Bookstore or Library
    Night classes, Beaufort campus: switchboard
    Hilton Head Center/Hampton Center: center office
    Other locations: as directed by instructor

13. Inform the instructor that the evaluation has been completed and return to class.

APPENDIX 2-B

INSTRUCTION SHEET TO INSTRUCTOR

(Given at time of evaluation)

On the day of student evaluation the instructor will complete the following steps in each class evaluated:

1. Complete the Beaufort Technical College Student Evaluation Cover Sheet. This process will require the noting of actual attendance in class the day of evaluation, the signing of the instructor's signature, and dating.

2. Give to the Student Proctor the Student Evaluation Cover Sheet and evaluation packet. The Student Proctor will sign and date the cover sheet.

3. Leave room in order that the student evaluation can be administered.

D-F/38-8 FE 6

APPENDIX 2-C

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTOR

INTERPRETATION OF DATA

In the week following student evaluation of instructor, instructors will receive the following results from the Office of Curriculum Development:

1. For each section an arithmetic average for each question. The question will be printed with the average shown at the end of the question.

2. A total arithmetic average of all questions for each section evaluated. This average will be shown at the bottom of each column.

3. A total arithmetic average of questions for all sections evaluated. This average will be presented on the left side of sheet.

4. An overall instructor rating.

The rating score for instructor evaluation is the arithmetic average of all Section A designated question responses. This average will be a number between four (4) and one (1). "Not Applicable or Don't Know" responses will not be computed. The rating is computed by individual student response to each question rather than class response. If fewer than half of the students responded to a particular question (or gave it "not applicable or don't know" response) that question is not counted or computed in the question/class/final averages.

Appendix 3

Student Evaluation of Advisor

Beaufort Technical College

Advising Evaluation Form

■	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	
—	⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐	

ADVISOR NAME

ADVISOR CODE

SAMPLE

Month / Day / Year

USE NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY

Your honest and thoughtful answers to these questions will provide useful information to your advisor and to the College. Please answer each question by marking the appropriate response. Your response is confidential; your advisor will not know how you personally answered these questions.

SECTION ONE: YOUR ADVISOR

Please read each statement carefully and select the response which in your judgement best describes your advisor. Mark only one response for each statement.

Strongly agree with statement	Agree with statement	Somewhat agree but needs improvement	Disagree and needs immediate attention	Not applicable or don't know	
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	1. My advisor was cooperative in arranging a time for academic advising.
					2. My advisor reviewed my curriculum profile by
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	a. identifying those courses that are required for graduation.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	b. identifying those courses that may be taken as electives.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	c. reviewing the courses already taken.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	d. discussing my academic progress in those courses already taken.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	e. discussing prerequisites and sequencing of courses.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	3. My advisor showed me the current schedule of courses and suggested a course schedule.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	4. My advisor helped to prepare a final course schedule.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	5. My advisor indicated the steps involved in the registration process.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	6. My advisor answered my questions with appropriate information.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	7. My advisor when necessary identified other people (or offices) to provide additional assistance or information.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	8. Overall, I consider my academic advisor to be a good academic advisor.

SECTION TWO: THE ADVISING PROCESS

Please read each statement carefully and select the response which in your judgement best describes the overall advising process at the College. Mark only one response for each statement.

Strongly agree with statement	Agree with statement	Somewhat agree but needs improvement	Disagree and needs immediate attention	Not applicable or don't know	
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	1. I was helped to select a program of study appropriate to my abilities.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	2. I was helped to select a program of study appropriate to my interests.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	3. I was given correct information about academic regulations.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	4. I was assigned to an appropriate Student Development counselor and/or academic advisor.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	5. I was given correct information about available financial assistance.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	6. The overall registration process was conducted in an efficient manner.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	7. I have received information about career opportunities.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	8. I have received information about additional educational opportunities.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	9. I have seen a Student Development Counselor and/or academic advisor frequently.
⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	⊏ ⊐	10. The student support services provided by the College were helpful in achieving my goals.

The College and faculty appreciate your assistance in improving our advising process and your cooperation in completing this form.

49

SCAN-TRON® FORM NO. 3488-BTC 841115-791

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX 3-B

ADMINISTRATION PROCEDURE FOR ADVISOR EVALUATION

1. Advisor evaluation will be conducted during announced registration periods during Fall and Winter quarters for the subsequent quarters.

2. The Advisor will be responsible for distribution and collection of all evaluation forms.

3. The evaluation is divided into two areas: (A) advisor evaluation and (B) advising process. Only (A) will be used to produce the advisor evaluation rating.

   A. Section 1: Advisor Evaluation
      questions 1-8

   B. Section 2: The Advising Process
      questions 1-10

4. Separate reports will be broken out for A and B data components. Only individual advisors, their department heads, and division deans will receive Advisor Evaluation (A). Summary A data and B data reports will be provided to the Dean of Instruction, as well as any others requesting it.

5. Each advisor and his/her supervisor will receive an interim evaluation results report at the conclusion of registration activity conducted during the Fall Quarter (for Winter Quarter). The final, overall report will be received during Spring Quarter.

6. All evaluation activity will be coordinated by the Director of Staff and Curriculum Development. Complete confidentiality of the process will be the responsibility of that individual.

APPENDIX 3-C

INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The rating score for advisor evaluation is the mean of all A-designated question responses. This average will be a number between four (4) and one (1). "Not Applicable or Don't Know" responses will not be computed.

This mean response is to be entered by the Rating Officer on the Faculty Evaluation Summary Form (INS 56).

D-F/02-19

Appendix 4

Portfolio Evaluation

SYLLABUS

I. Definition and Concept

A syllabus is a written course description containing required components (section III A) and optional components (section III B). The syllabus is used throughout the College as a consistent quality control document.

II. Required Syllabi

Each faculty member will be required to submit two syllabi prepared by the faculty member during the evaluation period. The first syllabus will be due by the end of the fall quarter, and the second syllabus will be due by the end of the winter quarter.

The syllabus submitted should be one that has not been previously evaluated. However, a syllabus that has been previously evaluated may be submitted if it contains major revisions.

III. Criteria

A. Required Elements for course Syllabus - The following elements must be included in each course syllabus. Satisfactory and correct inclusion of these elements earns a rating of M ("meets") for the course syllabus developer/reviser.

I. COVER PAGE (must use appropriate standard cover sheet)

1. Course Title and number; course credit (hours).

2. Catalog description (level I description).

3. Prerequiste or co-requisite (if none, so state).

4. Date of revision (or intial development) entered in block.

5. Effective date (first quarter to be used) entered in block.

6. Name(s) of person(s) responsible for development or revision entered in block.

II. STANDARD CONTENTS (contents that change usually no more than annually; inside pages)

1. Course objectives (level II description; may be expanded)

Upon successful completion of this course, the student should be competent to perform the following tasks:

2. Course topic outline.

3. Course requirements: must include course policies & procedures; attendance regulations; course standards, evaluation & criteria; and any other necessary course requirements and/or information.

4. Course resources and up-to-date bibliography. This should include both print and non-print materials and their location(s).

5. Any other necessay items of course process or procedures.

III. VARIABLE CONTENTS (contents that change from quarter to quarter or from instructor to instructor)

1. Course number and section number.

2. Course location and times.

3. Course instructor; office hours; office location; office telephone number.

4. Course text (including author, publisher, edition and date) and other required course materials, if any.

5. Course calendar of assignments, due dates, test schedule, etc.

6. Any other necessary items of information.

IV. STANDARD COLLEGE ATTACHMENT (single tear-off sheet; provided)

Statement of Transmittal

B. Exceptional criteria - Exceptional development of following criteria - general course objectives, course requirements, resources available to support course, and others designated and fully explained by the rating officer.

VI. Placement

Placement of evaluated course syllabus is as follows:

1. One copy with Rating Officer
2. One copy in Curriculum Development Office

V. Performance Levels

A. Below Performance Requirements--(1)--Faculty member does not meet a majority of basic criteria established for development of syllabus.

B. Needs Improvement--(2)--Faculty member does not meet all basic criteria established for development of syllabus.

C. Meets Performance Requirements--(3)--Faculty member meets all basic criteria established for development of syllabus.

D. Exceeds Performance Requirements--4--Faculty member meets all basic criteria and exceptional criteria established for development of syllabus.

VI. Self Report

The self report is optional. It, however, can be used to provide information for exceptional performance or explain deviation from norms specified in the criteria.

D-F/05 (1-3)

SAMPLE

Date of Development/Revision	Effective Date	Developed/Revised By

RATING OFFICER CHECK SHEET: SYLLABI

NAME: _____ (Rating Officer) DATE: _____

NAME: _____ (Instructor) COURSE NAME: _____ (First Syllabus)

COURSE NAME: _____ (Second Syllabus)

I. Instructions: If the criterion has been met, indicate by placing a check mark on the appropriate line. If the criterion has not been met, leave the line blank.

II. Criteria (required elements)

		Syllabus 1	Syllabus 2
A.	1. Course title, number, credit		
	2. Level I catalog description		
	3. Pre-register or co-register		
	4. Date of revision		
	5. Effective date		
	6. Course developer (s)		
B.	1. Level II course objectives		
	2. Topic outline		
	3. Course requirements		
	4. Course resources/Bibliography		
C.	1. Course number, section number		
	2. Course location, time		
	3. Course instructor, instructor information		
	4. Course text (s)		
	5. Course calendar		
D.	1. Statement of transmittal		

Exceptional Criteria - Exceptional development of elements B. 1, B. 3 and 4 of basic criteria. If exceptional criterion has been met for these elements, place a check mark on the appropriate line. If exceptional criterion has not been met, then leave the line blank.

	Syllabus 1	Syllabus 2
1. Course objectives	_____	_____
2. Course requirements	_____	_____
3. Resources/Bibliography	_____	_____
4. Other (explain)	_____	_____

III. Evaluation Rating

A. If the faculty member does not meet a majority of basic criteria then you will give the faculty member a rating of 1 which is Below Performance Requirements.

B. If the faculty member does not meet all basic criteria or does not justify the deviation from basic criteria in a self report, then you will give the faculty member a rating of 2 which is Needs Improvement.

C. If the faculty member meets all basic criteria established for development of the syllabus but does not meet all exceptional criteria, then you will give the faculty member a rating of 3 which is Meets Performance Requirements.

D. If the faculty member meets all basic criteria and exceptional criteria established for development of the syllabus, then you give the faculty member a rating of 4 which is Exceeds Performance Requirements.

IV. Overall Evaluation Result. Enter here and on BTC Form FE.

A. Syllabus 1

Evaluation rating _____

B. Syllabus 2

Evaluation rating _____

COLLEGE SERVICE

I. Definition and Concept

College Service is defined as service rendered by a faculty member in support of his/her department, division or total college.

II. Evaluation Weighting Guildelines

Suggested weighting for selected college service functions is given below. A Rating Officer may vary the evaluation weighting, given the nature and scope of the service function.

SERVICE FUNCTION	EVALUATION WEIGHTING
Member of standing committee of the college	5%
Member of ad hoc committee of the college	5%
Participant in special project(s) established by College to meet a particular goal or objective	5%
Participant as individual or as member of a small group in curriculum development or curriculum modification	5%
Advisor or contributor to student club or student activity	5%
Participant as individual or as member of state committee	5%
Contributor in support of organized activities of College	5%
Division Representative of Faculty Executive Council	5%
President, Vice President, or Secretary of the Faculty Senate	10%
Member of Peer Appeals Panel	10%
Other (with approval of Division Dean)	5%

Chairman and Secretary - 5% in addition to weighting for any committee membership (Faculty Senate offices are not included).

III. Criteria

A. Basic Criteria

1. Participation: Faculty member has participated on a regular basis in scheduled activities of college service function. As a member of a College committee, faculty member has attended 75% or more of called meetings.

2. Timeliness: The activities of the college service function for which a faculty member is responsible have been completed on time as planned.

3. Leadership: If a faculty member serves as chairman of committee, the faculty member is responsible for preparation of agendas. If faculty member serves as secretary of committee, faculty member is responsible for minutes of meetings, including list of members present and absent.

B. Exceptional Criteria: Faculty member has actively participated and played a significant part in achievement of the objective(s) of a College committee or other college service function.

IV. Performance Levels

A. Below Performance Requirements--(1)--Faculty member does not meet majority of basic criteria established for college service.

B. Needs Improvement--(2)--Faculty member does not meet all basic criteria established for college service.

C. Meets Performance Requirements--(3)--Faculty member meets all basic criteria established for college service.

D. Exxceeds Performance Requirements--(4)--Faculty member meets all basic and exceptional criteria established for college service.

V. Sources of Evaluation

A. Self Report - The self report is optional. It, however, can be used to provide information for exceptional performance or explain deviation from norms specified in the criteria.

B. Reports from chairman of committee(s).

C. Rating Officer

VI. Enter overall rating on BTC form FE.

COMMUNITY SERVICE

I. Definition and Concept

Community service is defined as the application of a faculty member's recognized area of expertise in the community without pay.

Community service is an optional item as an area of evaluation and, while it is encouraged, it is not required.

II. Evaluation Weighting

Evaluation weighting for community service is 0% to 10%. Weighting for each community service function will be determined by Rating Oficer based on the nature and scope of the service function.

III. Criteria

A. Basic Criteria

1. Participation: Faculty member has participated on a regular basis in scheduled activities of community service function.

2. Timeliness: The activities of the community service functions have been completed on time, as planned.

B. Exceptional Criteria: Faculty member has actively participated and played a significant part in achievement of the objective(s) of the community service function.

IV. Performance Levels

A. Below Performance Requirements--(1)--Faculty member does not meet a majority of basic criteria established for community service.

B. Needs Improvement--(2)--Faculty member does not meet all basic criteria established for community service.

C. Meets Performance Requirements--(3)--Faculty member meets all basic criteria established for community service.

D. Exceeds Performance Requirements--(4)--Faculty member meets all basic criteria and achieves exceptional criteria for community service.

V. Sources of Evaluation

A. Self Report - The self report is optional. It, however, can be used to provide information for exceptional performance or explain deviation from norms specified in the criteria

B. Letters and/or reports from community organization.

C. Rating Officer

VI. Enter overall rating on BTC form FE.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

I. Definition and Concept

Professional development is defined as activities that will develop professional and personal competencies so as to improve the faculty member's knowledge skills and proficiency in their present position. This item will tie in with advancement on the compensation plan.

II. Evaluation Activities

A. Academic advancement - degree earned, certification, courses taken, CEU's, etc.

B. Occupational experience - work related to teaching field.

C. Professional association - membership, offices, committees, etc.

D. Attendance at/or participation in professional conferences.

E. Research and publications - journals, books, editorships, reading in field, self-paced instruction, etc.

III. Faculty Development Plan

A faculty development plan must be submitted for each obje4ctive to the Rating Officer.

IV. Evaluation Weighting Guidelines

The weighting of each activity will be dependent upon time commitment, nature, and scope of the activity. The following are suggested weightings based upon time commitment.

A. 20 to 25 percent per activity - no less than 80 hours (equivalent to two full weeks).

B. 10 to 15 percent activity - no less than 40 hours (equivalent to one full week).

C. 10 percent per activity - no less than 2 days.

D. 5 percent per activity - no less than 1 day.

V. Criteria

Evaluation criteria will be defined by the faculty member in the Faculty Development Plan.

IV. Performance Levels

A. Below Performance Requirements--(1)--Faculty member does not meet majority of basic criteria established for professional devwelopment.

B. Needs Improvement--(2)--Faculty member does not meet all basic established criteria for professionakl development.

C. Meets Performance Requirements--(3)--Faculty member meets all basic criteria established for professional development.

D. Exceeds Performance Requirements--4--Faculty member meets all basic criteria and has achieved exceptional performance for professional development.

VII. Sources of Evaluation

A. Self Report - The self report is optional. It, however, can be used to provide information for exceptinal performance or explain deviation from norms specified in the criteria.

B. Rating Officer

APPENDIX 4-D

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Provide concise but thorough responses to each of the following areas:

1. Project Title
2. Weighting Request
3. Project Description
4. Project Activities/Objectives (list)
5. Evaluation Criteria
6. Resources Requested
7. Projected Completion Date of Project

_____ _____
(Faculty Member) (Date)

_____ _____
(Rating Officer) (Date)

_____ _____
(Other Coordinating Signatures as Needed) (Date)

Note: This form should be attached to the Faculty Member's planning sheet of the Faculty Performance Management System.

Rating Given By Rating Officer: _____

(The average rating for professional development will be placed on BTC form FE.)

FACLT/2-7

Appendix 5

Subcommittee on Faculty Evaluation Membership

FACULTY SENATE SUBCOMMITTEES

FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

Membership 1986-87

Business Division Representative:	Harold Wesley
Industrial Division Representative:	Bill Pringle
General Studies Division Representative:	Cheryl Ward
Human Services Division Representative:	Amanda Patterson
Dean's Representative:	Bud Marchant

D-F/14

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges FEB 27 1987